

16 February 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Reaction to 11 February Youth Forum Panel

As requested, I present herewith my recollections and understanding of the circumstances involving and related to the panel session on "The Agency and American Youth" which occurred on the afternoon of 11 February as part of the Forum on Youth and Student Affairs. Please note that as organizer and "administrator" (rather than Moderator in the strict sense) of the entire program, I was personally much preoccupied with the mechanics of the program and supporting arrangements -- e.g., adequacy of the microphone systems -- and thus do not have a complete and detailed memory of the substantive content. The reports of other OTR staff members present will undoubtedly be more complete and reliable on this score.

# I. ORIGIN OF THE PANEL

Early in planning for the Forum it was recognized that the content to be presented by guest speakers should, if possible, be related directly to the Agency and its mission. How to do so was obvious for the proposed portion on foreign youth -- an Agency panel composed of specialists concerned with operations and analysis as affected by youth and student problems. For the proposed domestic portion, informal discussions within OTR generated the idea (which actually originated with Mr. [redacted] of a second Agency panel to be composed of spokesmen for OP, OS and OMS to comment on what guest speakers might have said and to indicate whether the Agency had taken or was considering any steps to recognize and adjust to changes in the domestic youth scene. 25X1

It seemed evident that the proposed panel would necessarily include the Deputy Director of Personnel for Recruitment and Placement, Mr. [redacted]. I therefore sounded out Mr. [redacted] informally as to what he thought of the idea. The latter thought it might be a useful vehicle for educating the presumed across the board audience, but specified that it must be approved at the Directorate level. Accordingly Mr. [redacted] and I met with the ADDS on 11 January to discuss the proposal. Mr. Wattles approved on two conditions: (1) that the Office heads concerned (OP, OS, OMS) would 25X1 25X1

SECRET

agree and would designate their spokesmen; and (2) that the designated panel members would meet in advance to discuss and coordinate their general approaches to the topic. Both conditions were fulfilled. Dr. Tietjen designated Dr. [ ] Chief of the Psychiatric Staff, and Mr. Osborn designated Mr. [ ], Assistant Deputy Director for Personnel Security. 25X1

## II. THE PANEL SETTING

The audience which appeared for the panel being discussed was youthful as compared with that present the first day and that which turned out the previous morning for a presentation which had to be cancelled. The crowd of approximately 175 on hand for the first speaker of the afternoon, Mr. Inman of the State Department, swelled to approximately 225 for the panels. Thus it was a self-selected audience interested particularly in the panel subjects.

Members of the new CT class, which as a group had been in the forefront of audience questioning of speakers the previous day, generally had less to say at this session, though one or two individuals were quite vocal in questioning the panel.

In opening the panel session as Forum moderator, I noted the intent of the panel as an effort to "bring down to earth" remarks concerning the domestic youth scene in terms of its possible impact on the Agency. Early in the session, however, questions from the floor shifted the focus to Agency management policies and practices, where it remained.

At the conclusion of the session there were two rounds of applause -- interrupted by my comment, in thanking the panel, that we should consider devoting more time to discussion of such matters. I interpreted the applause as intended for the panel as well as for the liveliness of audience participation.

There were no non-Agency people at the panel session.

## III. THE PANEL SESSION

As previously agreed, Mr. [ ] opened the session with an approximately half-hour long summary of the Agency's contact with college campuses for recruiting, and ways in which Agency procedures and practices are being modified or reconsidered to take account of 25X1

SECRET

the changing American youth scene -- e.g., no automatic turning away from "long hair," some brief tolerance of prior experimentation with soft (but not hard) drugs, etc. He presented statistics indicating that the campus input continues to be of high quality, though in some areas (Ivy league) we find it at the graduate school level rather than in the colleges. The other panel members, Dr. [REDACTED] had brief elaborating remarks.

From the outset of the question/discussion period, members of the audience changed the intended thrust of the session and focussed more on internal management and youth. The first question, by a member of the CT class, concerned the relevance of fitness reports. Mr. [REDACTED] reply was lengthy and seemed to satisfy the questioner. Next, however, he was challenged by several questioners with the implication that he presented "the official line" rather than what the questioners asserted to be the facts -- e.g., the latter were certain the Agency is "losing the best young people" rather than retaining most of them, as Mr. [REDACTED] statistics indicated. His reply that studies on the subject bore out his statement was not accepted. Several warm exchanges followed on this and on the problem of the Agency image vis-a-vis the academic community and youth. Two of the leaders of these lines of questioning were also scheduled to be members of the panel on the impact of foreign youth on the Agency, which convened later that afternoon. They were [REDACTED] of OCI and [REDACTED] of ONE, both former CT's considered outstanding in their class. For the record, they are also officially identified as among the few "youth experts" the Agency has in the Intelligence Directorate.

#### IV. PREVIOUS EVIDENCE OF SIMILAR EMPLOYEE VIEWS

Over the years there have been numerous -- and increasing -- situations in training courses at all levels reflecting employee discontent with the "official line." I refer to the Midcareer Course, the Advanced Intelligence Seminar (and its predecessor the Intelligence Review), the former Intelligence Orientation Course, which until recently admitted employees of all ages, regardless of time in the Agency, who had not taken the orientation course. In all these courses there has been running criticism of "self-congratulatory back patting" and failure to "tell it like it is" by official speakers. Such comments have always been in the context of the experienced employees' desire for a realistic approach to a demanding profession which has its difficulties as well as its successes.

Another stream of evidence that the views expressed by the Forum audience are far from novel lies in our recent experiences, dating back a year or so, with having panels of young professionals (Career Trainees or members of the Management Advisory Groups) appear in the MEDC and AIS and in the former special Intelligence Orientation for Career Trainees. In such sessions the existence of a generation gap has usually been apparent, as well as the existence of sharply divided reactions among the older professionals toward the views of the younger.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, supplemented by recollections and impressions of other OTR staff members present, it seems to me that the Forum session merely surfaced again -- to a larger audience than is customary in training courses -- the fact that younger professionals (or at least an articulate and intelligent element among them) -- differ from their predecessors of the 1950's era in being far more critical and questioning toward their jobs as well as all other aspects of life. In short, we have tried to select promising members of the younger generation and in so doing have inevitably taken aboard with them the laudably critical and questioning spirit we admire in the best institutions of higher learning. The particular form it took -- whether it is termed "rapping" or (by oldsters) "bitching" -- seems an ingrained aspect of the new Youth Culture.

It is possible that the Forum has unwittingly performed a major service to Agency management in focussing attention on this situation as no other institutional arrangement yet devised has done. I sincerely hope that management will view this situation in perspective and regard it as warranting bold and positive measures to open up further channels of communication. After all, this is the essence of the philosophy of management officially adopted for inculcation by the Agency -- the Managerial Grid. Those managers who see merit in the Grid cannot overlook the possibilities for implementing it with the younger generation already aboard, let alone that which is bound to come later.

The spirit which awaits such an initiative seems evident in the remark of one of the chief critics of the Forum panel: he disagreed with what he felt was a rosy picture of the Agency's image but that "regardless of the distorted image of the Agency actually held by outsiders" he "is sustained by knowledge of and faith in the Agency's mission and efforts."



25X1

~~SECRET~~